REMARKS

Claims 1, 19, and 34 have been amended. No new matter is introduced by the amendments of these claims. Accordingly, claims 1-51 remain pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 10-14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25-29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37, 39, 43-47, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Laster et al (US 2001/0029478) in view of Capiel (US 6,449,634). Additionally, claims 3, 5, 8, 9, 15, 18, 21, 23, 30, 33, 36, 38, 41, 42, 48, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Laster and Capiel in view of Abendroth (US 2002/0087371). The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed as follows.

Claim 1 is directed towards a "method for provisioning services." Claim 1 further recites "providing a service manager system operable to mediate messages sent with respect to a plurality of services of a plurality of different providers, wherein the services include different sets of one or more computer applications." That is, the service manager system is configured to mediate messages with respect to the different computer applications of a plurality of services from different providers. Claim 1 also recites "receiving a first offer pertaining to a first service and a second offer pertaining to a second service that includes one or more computer applications that differs from the one or more computer applications of the first service, the first offer being provided by a first provider of the first service to which the first offer pertains and being transmitted from a first device to the service manager system, the second offer being provided by a second provider of the second service to which the second offer pertain and being transmitted from a second device to the service manager" and "receiving identifying information regarding one or more first invitees to be invited to access the first service of the first offer, the identifying information regarding the one or more first invitees being transmitted from the first device to the service manager system, and receiving identifying information regarding one or more second invitees to be invited to access the second service of the second offer, the identifying information regarding the one or more second invitees being transmitted from the second device to the service manager system." Claim 1 also recites "in response to receipt of the first offer and the identifying information regarding the one or more first invitees, providing by the service manager system an invitation to each of the one or more first invitees to access the first service of the first offer through the service manager system and based on the received identifying information regarding the one or more first invitees." A similar operation is repeated for the second offer for the second service. Independent claims 19 and 34 recite mechanisms for performing or providing the operations of claim 1.

Embodiments of the present invention are configured to mediate access to a plurality of service, and their associated different applications, from a plurality of providers at a single

service manager. This mediation can efficiently and flexibly provide service management for any number and type of service applications and providers. To clarify this feature, claim 1 has been amended to recite limitations for handling two different offers from <u>two services that include different sets of one or more computer applications</u> being transmitte<u>d from two different devices</u>.

In contrast, the primary reference Laster is directed towards a single service application, namely an auction service. Thus, Laster necessarily fails to teach or suggest the handling, by a service manager system, of two different offers from two different services, having two different sets of one or more computer applications, from two different devices, in the manner claimed. Laster does not teach a flexible system that can manage offers to a diverse number and type of services and their varying applications, in the manner claimed. Likewise, the secondary reference Capiel suffers from the same deficiency. Capiel is directed towards handling emails, rather than managing offers from different services having different sets of applications, in the manner claimed.

Although different applications are taught by the Laster and Capiel references, both references fail to teach or suggest techniques (or mechanisms) for handling different sets of applications <u>at a single service manager system</u>, in the manner claimed. That is, both Laster and Capiel fail to teach or suggest that a service manager system receives two offers for both a first and a second service having different computer applications. Additionally, both Laster and Capiel fail to teach or suggest a service manager that is operable to send invitations to invitees specified by the offers for different services that contain different sets of applications, in the manner claimed. In sum, the server systems of Laster and Capiel are not configured to handle more than one type of application.

Specifically, the Laster reference teaches a single server (14 of Fig. 1) for handling service requests for a single auction application, while Capiel teaches a single server (130 of Fig. 1) for handling emails for an email application. Laster fails to teach or suggest that this auction server can handle offers for services that contain different set of computer applications, in the manner claimed. Likewise, Capiel fails to teach or suggest that their email server can handle offers for services that contain different sets of computer applications, in the manner claimed. Neither reference, thus, teaches or suggests techniques (or mechanisms) for efficiently and flexibly handling offers for a diverse set of services and their differing applications at a service manager system, in the manner claimed. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 19, and 34 are patentable over the cited art.

The Examiner's rejections of the dependent claims are also respectfully traversed. However, to expedite prosecution, all of these claims will not be argued separately. Claims 2-18, 20-33, and 35-51 each depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 19, or 34 and, therefore, are respectfully submitted to be patentable over cited art for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 19, or 34. Further, the dependent claims require additional elements that when considered in context of the claimed inventions further patentably distinguish the invention from the cited art.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER, LLP

/Mary R. Olynick/

Mary R. Olynick
Reg. 42,963

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100